



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

aims of Christianity. The resolution was adopted, and next December the peace movement will be fairly launched among the Chinese Christian communities.

. . . The Sagamore Sociological Conference, held for three days at the middle of June under the auspices of the Christian Endeavor Society, adopted the following message and cabled it to the American delegation at The Hague:

"The Sagamore Sociological Conference, remembering America's responsibility in calling the Hague Conference, earnestly hopes for strong American effort for limitation of armaments and for the broadest program."

Dr. Francis E. Clark, who proposed the message and supported it in a strong speech, has just returned from an extended trip in South America, where he reports the sentiment against the war system to be deep and widespread.

. . . Dr. Edward Everett Hale, who strongly upholds the proposal for limitation of armaments, as well as the other measures advocated by the Interparliamentary Union, has cabled to Mr. Choate at The Hague that the American people may be relied upon to support the most advanced action by the Conference. That cablegram uttered the truth for the great body of our citizens.

. . . We have previously mentioned that Bishop Doane of Albany authorized a prayer for use in the churches of his diocese for the successful issue of the Hague Conference. A similar prayer was also authorized by Bishop William A. Leonard of Ohio. In speaking of the matter Bishop Leonard said: "If arbitration between governments, as well as between warring factions in trade and labor, can eventually be brought about, we shall have cause to rejoice before God for one of the great accomplishments of his infinite desire."

. . . The International Medical Association, which was organized in Paris two years ago, is to have an American branch. A meeting for the organization of this branch was held in Atlantic City on June 5. Dr. W. Benham Snow, editor of *The Journal of Advanced Therapeutics*, was elected president of the American section.

. . . The decision of President Roosevelt, on the recommendation of Secretary Root, to ask congress next winter to reduce the indemnity from China to this country for losses incurred during the Boxer trouble from \$24,440,778 to less than half that sum, will meet with the hearty approval of all good citizens. The amount demanded has been found to be out of all reason, and hence this proposal to clear our national skirts of the stain of open plunder. The retiring Chinese minister, Sir Chen Tung Liang, says: "This action is another monument to America's high sense of justice." Yes, that is true. But we wish our high sense of justice might go a little higher still in our dealings with China.

### Some Hints as to the Future Work of the Hague Conference.

*Address of Hon. Andrew D. White, LL.D., former Ambassador to Germany and to Russia, and Member of the first Hague Conference, at the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, Wednesday evening, May 28.*

The more I reflect upon that which was accomplished at the Hague Conference of 1899, the more am I persuaded that it was good, and that in it lie the germs of

various growths which will be better. As the main result of that first session, there exists an International Tribunal. The judges constituting this Tribunal have been appointed. They have been given full diplomatic inviolability, immunities and privileges as regards their persons, families and belongings. A permanent administrative committee, composed of the representatives of the various nations at The Hague, presided over by the Netherlands Minister of Foreign Affairs, is always ready, at a moment's notice, to attend to every sort of preliminary detail, including formal invitations to any powers in difficulty with each other to submit their differences for adjudication; and it may be added that an international palace of justice, with an international law library, has been provided by an honored American citizen, and will soon be an outward and visible sign to the whole world that this great international court exists.

In addition to all this, there were provided by the Hague Conference of 1899 means for delaying, hindering and even preventing war; and among these, first, a more practical system of tendering "good offices;" secondly, a system of seconding powers, under which each one of two nations, when drifting into war, is encouraged to call in the service of some other nation, there being thus imposed upon both the nations thus called upon the duty of studying and submitting some means for establishing peace; and, in case they are unsuccessful, the duty of declaring any war which may ensue virtually ended so soon as either of the belligerent powers directly concerned shall be placed in a condition of absolute inferiority to the other; thirdly, provision was made for "International Commissions of Inquiry," the duty of which should be to make research into the real causes and nature of any difficulties arising between the two nations especially concerned, and to state them, with any means available for settling them, thus avoiding the present system of leaving serious questions arising between two nations to the inflammatory influences of the more or less yellow presses of the nations concerned, and, indeed, of other nations. Other things for diminishing the horrors and miseries of war were accomplished which are likely to be fruitful in good, the whole work constituting a very great and distinct gain to the world.

Taking them up in the order above given, I would say a few words, first, regarding the plan for arbitration. Remembering, as I do, vividly, the debates upon it in all its phases, I doubt whether some of the efforts which have been recently made, in large public meetings and elsewhere, are likely to accomplish any very permanent results. Speeches made in immense halls, in the presence of crowded galleries, applauding any plea for peace as wildly as under other circumstances they would applaud any utterance for war, mark a very different sort of meeting from that which made the arrangements for arbitration as we now have them, or that which will shortly be assembled in order to develop the work of the first Conference still further. For in that meeting in the spring of 1899, as will doubtless be the case in the approaching meeting during this spring of 1907, there were no galleries, no visitors, no spectators, no reporters; there were no appeals to passion, and very rarely was there anything like applause. Indeed, there was a general feeling that anything save earnest, close, careful discussion of the questions involved was utterly out of place. Not a harsh

word was spoken during the entire Conference. It was, in fact, a meeting of men who had given long and careful thought to the subjects involved, who realized the vast importance of them, and who felt that their personal honor was involved in arriving at the best solution possible.

Various suggestions have been made since the adjournment of that first Conference in 1899, some thoughtful and pregnant, some mainly declamatory, and of one or two of these it would seem well to speak at present.

First, it has been argued that the Hague Tribunal should sit steadily and permanently, thus resembling the Supreme Court of the United States. This idea was embodied in the first American proposal made in 1899, but an almost unanimous opinion was soon developed against it. It was objected, with much force, that the expense of maintaining such a court in permanent session would be irksome to all the powers, and that upon some of them it would bear somewhat heavily. It was also urged that such a court, in continuous solemn session, having certainly, during intervals of many months, and perhaps even during years, nothing to do, would probably become an object of ridicule, and that finally, even among the greater powers, a sentiment would arise which would give opportunities for demagogues to move to strike out the appropriations for the maintenance of a court apparently accomplishing nothing. These considerations prevailed, and the Tribunal was established as we now have it. It is my belief that any effort to change the present system during the session of 1907 will be met by the same arguments which were urged in 1899, and with the same result.

The next and greatest suggestion as to change is that of substituting compulsory arbitration for the voluntary arbitration now established.

During the session of 1899, the Russian delegates presented a plan for obligatory arbitration, of which Article 10 runs as follows:

"From and after the ratification of the present treaty by all the signatory powers, arbitration shall be obligatory in the following cases, so far as they do not affect vital interests or the national honor of the contracting states :

"1. In the case of differences or conflicts regarding pecuniary damages suffered by a state or its citizens, in consequence of illegal or negligent action on the part of any state or the citizens of the latter.

"2. In the case of disagreements or conflicts regarding the interpretation or application of treaties or contentions upon the following subjects :

"(1.) Treaties concerning postal and telegraphic service and railways, as well as those having for their object the protection of submarine telegraphic cables; rules concerning the means of preventing collisions on the high seas; conventions concerning the navigation of international rivers and interoceanic canals.

"(2.) Conventions concerning the protection of literary and artistic property, as well as industrial and proprietary rights (patents, trade-marks and commercial names); conventions regarding monetary affairs, weights and measures; conventions regarding sanitary affairs and veterinary precautions and measures against the phylloxera.

"(3.) Conventions regarding inheritances, extraditions and mutual judicial assistance.

"(4.) Boundary conventions or treaties, so far as they concern purely technical, and not political, questions."

It seems a good omen for the future that the Conference seemed ready to adopt obligatory arbitration to this extent, and that it was dropped only when Germany,

Austria and Italy insisted on its rejection as a condition to their signing the arbitration treaty.

Another encouraging feature is the fact that of these three powers, Austria and Italy were evidently in favor of adopting this restricted obligatory arbitration, and refrained from doing so only on account of their supposed duty to stand by their ally in European matters. Still another encouraging feature is that the objections of Germany did not appear to be based on any close reasoning or invincible prejudice, but rather to be the result of a temporary feeling of distrust regarding the aims of some of the European powers involved. It should be added, also, that the clause was stricken out by the delegates of the United States, namely, that concerning the navigation of international rivers and interoceanic canals, this fact being due to a fear that the clause might embarrass our country in its efforts to secure a waterway across the Isthmus of Panama.

Remembering the discussions of 1899, and the atmosphere in which they were conducted, I feel that this Russian proposal might well be taken up again during the approaching session and possibly be made the basis for some further development. Further reflection by the powers which formerly opposed it may well lead them to consider it, in its main features, as not only admissible, but exceedingly useful. But in various public meetings and in sundry articles it has been proposed to make the arbitration exercised by the Hague Tribunal entirely compulsory. To this I note the following objections :

First, it subjects the Tribunal either to the reproach of being an impotent body or to the necessity of drawing drafts upon the energies of the nations represented by it, which would result in a condition of things far worse than that which exists to-day. For if compulsory arbitration means anything, it means the establishment of a force which can carry out the decisions of the Tribunal, and this means putting into the field greater standing armies than any from which the world is now suffering.

Think, for a moment, of some of the questions involving, not infrequently, very deep political, national, racial and even religious feelings which might be brought before the Tribunal. Among these would quite likely be those between France and Germany, relating to Alsace-Lorraine; between Russia, Austria and Turkey, regarding the Balkan States; between Turkey and Greece; between Italy and Austria, regarding the Tridentine territories and the lands bordering upon the northeast coast of the Adriatic; and between the United States and one or more of the great European or Asiatic powers, say, those relating to the rights of Chinese or Japanese throughout our republic, or the rights of members of the Italian Mafia or Camorra or Black Hand organizations. As to these, suppose that when we make answer to the decision of the Tribunal, a vast majority of our people are unalterably opposed to the admission of the persons concerned, or that under our Constitution we have no means of remedying the abuses complained of, and suppose then that the Tribunal says that we *ought* to have some means, and must find some, what, in the opinion of any person here present, would be the result of such action by the Tribunal upon the majority of American citizens? Does any one suppose that a majority of our people could be induced to arbitration compelling the universal admission of Chinese coolies or the placing of full grown Japanese

among the little children in our State schools? A saying of a good, sensible, old mediæval bishop, Ulrich of Augsburg, seems to apply. When sundry theologians were urging various extreme logical consequences of supposed scriptural dogmas, he said: "Draw not upon the breasts of Holy Writ too hard, lest you obtain blood rather than milk." And so it may be said regarding arbitration. Leave much to the civilizing influences of thought and time, and do not press doctrines which, in all probability, would result in the discredit of all arbitration, or in unlimited bloodshed, or in both.

In my judgment, all work done in behalf of compulsory arbitration, save within the main limits suggested in 1899 by Russia, will not merely be work thrown away, but work which may finally bring to naught the system already adopted, with all its possibilities of great good to the world. Consider merely the initiatory steps. How are the nations to drag the German Empire before the Tribunal to discuss questions which may open up the whole matter of the title to Alsace-Lorraine? How is Austria to be dragged before the Tribunal to discuss her right to territories which the Irredentist party in Italy insists are Italian? Supposing that public sentiment in Russia should at last side with Armenia,—how is the Turkish Empire to be brought before the Tribunal? Is it not clear that the moment the principle of obligatory arbitration on a large scale is adopted there will be an embittering of questions which, if left to themselves, are, under the influence of time and thought, far more likely to work themselves out peacefully?

And granting that these powers above referred to, with various others that could be named, be brought to plead before the Tribunal, and suppose, as must be the case, one or the other of the nations is worsted in the international court — what then follows? What decision of any court will induce the German nation to give up Alsace-Lorraine? or Austria to give up the Tridentine and Dalmatian territories? or Japan to give up Corea? Consider how difficult it was even in the little question between Turkey and Greece, ten years ago, to induce the leading European powers to intervene, and how absurd their intervention became before it was finished.

It is said, indeed, that instead of interfering by arms, the various nations could enforce the decrees of the Tribunal by showing their disapproval of the nation refusing to submit to compulsory arbitration by a sort of boycott, or, possibly, by the cessation of commercial relations. Any one who has read the history of the attempt made by the first Napoleon to enforce non-intercourse between the continent of Europe, when he virtually held it in the hollow of his hand, and Great Britain, will see at once some cogent reasons why such a system must come to naught.

So far, then, as improvements in arbitration are concerned, there seem to me two opportunities: the first is open to the approaching session of the Conference. It is to take up again the Russian proposal for obligatory arbitration in minor matters. The second is, that the public at large be so educated by discussion that whenever international differences shall arise, we shall all insist that they be submitted to the Tribunal. In this latter case, a public feeling might be created which would throw out of power any government which should refuse any reasonable resort to arbitration. As to what can be

done in this way, we have an example in the development in 1895 of what was known as the Venezuela question. The government of the United States took decided, and as I believe just, action in the premises, and the people at large in public meetings so strongly expressed their feeling that Lord Salisbury was at last forced, sorely against his will, to submit the questions at issue to arbitration.

Another point in favor of peace which might be strengthened has to do with the provisions made in the first Conference for delaying, hindering and preventing war. It is well known that at the beginning of the Russo-Japanese war these means were not resorted to. Neither reminders of the Tribunal nor Commissions of Inquiry nor the system of seconding powers seem to have been thought of. It is evident that if these provisions are to be made effective, there must be a recasting and strengthening of them, and to this the approaching Conference may well address itself.

Yet another question which will undoubtedly arise is that of limitation of armaments. In the former session the attempt to deal with this question failed completely. The proposals of the special committee on the subject were wrecked as soon as they appeared in the general session. The reason was simple. The questions involved require an enormous amount of technical and, indeed, one may say, mathematical study and calculation. The powers of the most expert actuary would be taxed to the utmost in calculating just what would be equivalent reductions, naval and military, between any two of the great powers, let alone half a dozen of them. The question is one of immense difficulty. I must confess to a belief that, while some system of limitation may be reached at a later period, nothing very effective will be done at the approaching session of the Hague Conference. Germany has already, through Chancellor von Bülow, announced her opposition to it, and the other powers differ hopelessly regarding it. It will come,—it *must* come,—but not yet.

Another point which has been dwelt upon by sundry speakers and writers has been the advisability of aiding, by all means possible, the means of delaying hostilities, on the ground that in this manner the war feeling in the nations concerned may be allowed time to cool; but while there is force in this, there is force in an objection which was especially insisted upon at the former Conference by one of the most eminent of its members, Count Münster, president of the German delegation, that delays, to any great extent, would promote war rather than hinder it; that they would encourage powers which are always notoriously unready for belligerent operations, by giving them time to get ready, and that this would operate to the disadvantage of sundry peaceful nations which keep themselves in readiness to mobilize their armies in the shortest time possible. Whether this argument be convincing or not, it certainly indicates a line of thought which will prevent some of the greater powers from extending the period during which approaching hostilities can be delayed far beyond the time at present provided for.

I now come to what seems to me one of the most promising fields for the activity of our delegates at the approaching Conference, and this is the doctrine, which may fairly be called the *American Doctrine*, of the immunity

of private property, not contraband, from seizure in time of war. I need hardly remind an audience like this that the record of our country in regard to this doctrine is exceedingly honorable. We have urged it from the foundation of our government. We have even favored it when our interests seemed to be against it. At the Hague session in 1899 we again urged it, but were met by the argument, which it was impossible to overcome, that the Conference could not go into the consideration of any subject outside the purposes for which it was called. Therefore it was that the American delegation made a sort of compromise with those opposed to taking up this question, and contented itself with the passing of a unanimous declaration referring the matter to the next session of the Conference. It was the best that could be done, and it is to be hoped that the question may now be brought up with better hopes of success than in 1899.

Another matter which may well be considered and which has in it the germs of good future growths is, in my opinion, the preparation of an international code in regard to the rights and duties of neutrals. It was especially recommended by the Hague Conference of 1899 to any future conference, and it is greatly to be desired that thought be aroused on this subject among all who make international law a study, and that the public at large be enlightened as to the value of a better neutrality code in the interest of international justice and peace.

It has also been urged, and especially by Russia, in the documents preparatory to calling the Conference of 1899, that means should be taken to prevent the invention of new and more terrible instruments of war and to limit changes in armaments. Certainly this was a natural suggestion, in view of the enormous waste of money involved in constant changes of machines of war on land and sea. But even granting that it were practicable, after all, is it desirable? May it not be that the constant and terrible additions to means of destruction in war are among the most powerful deterrents, not only to declarations of war, but to conduct leading to war?

The greatest trust, after all, as regards the future peace of nations, must be in the uplifting of peoples, and in so uplifting them that when demagogues are taking a line of conduct likely to end in war between any two nations the people concerned may say: "We have a great international court already established to meet just such cases as this. The judges are already appointed. The international court-house stands open. A commission is already appointed to take all the preliminary measures. Let us try arbitration first." This is the feeling that we should carefully cultivate, and I would gladly have seen in the recent peace meetings more of an insistence upon what has already been done and what may be accomplished by the agencies already in existence, rather than loud calls for new systems which, even if possible, are of very doubtful utility.

Let me say here that I speak not at all as a pessimist. As an American, I am proud of the record our country has made: first, as regards the assertion of the rights and duties of neutrals, as far back as the time of Washington and Jefferson, in 1793; secondly, of our arguments, steadily, in season and out of season, favoring the immunity of private property, not contraband, from

seizure at sea; thirdly, of the fact that the United States, more than any other power, labored in behalf of arbitration at the Hague Conference of 1899; that, more frequently than any other power, she has resorted to arbitration to settle international difficulties; that, since the establishment of the Hague Tribunal, she has so often resorted to it; and, finally, that our nation, through the present President, intervened so skillfully and effectively to put an end to the terrible war in the East, which had become a frightful calamity, and was sure, if not stopped, to result speedily in the bankruptcy of both combatants. Of all this I am vastly proud, but I note the fact that it has been done, not by force or threats of force, but by the cultivation of a great public sentiment in favor of peace and against war. But I also note that much more remains to be done. Our own recent history as regards war shows how readily the nation can be wrought upon to favor hostilities against any other nation whatever. My hope is that the increasing study of international law will act powerfully in favor of legal remedies to international difficulties, and that from the great number who are now in our universities and colleges giving themselves largely to studies of relations between states, there will filter down through pulpit and press into the midst of the people a sentiment ever growing stronger and stronger, which will make arbitration compulsory in a higher sense than any which suggests, even remotely, anything in the nature of warlike methods.

In conclusion, let me refer to one matter which ought to encourage us all. In the spring of 1899 there was very little reason to believe that the Conference then in session was more than a single passing event in the history of the world. There were, indeed, references from time to time to a possible future conference, notably when the American plan for giving immunity to private property, not contraband, on the high seas, was referred to the next Conference. But there was undoubtedly a sense of unreality in the minds of many when this reference was made, and it doubtless seemed to not a few like putting the matter over until the Greek kalends.

But we were building better than we knew. It can now be seen that the system of conferences between the nations has, if we properly exert ourselves, come to stay. Here a duty may be suggested to us all. A public opinion should be developed which will consider such international sessions as natural and moral, as a matter of right, of humanity, as a thing of course.

My final counsel, then, as regards our duty, is that we steadily labor to develop a public feeling which will demand that the Hague Conference meet at regular intervals, and that it boldly take the highest international interests as its province.

### The Interparliamentary Union Program for the Second Hague Conference.

*Address of Hon. Richard Bartholdt, M.C., at the National Peace Congress, New York, April 17.*

*Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:* Victor Hugo once said: "Peace is the virtue, war the crime of civilization." This great Congress of Americans, held on the eve of the second Hague Conference, is to demonstrate to our government, as well as to the